



1654
TFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Alfred Jonczyk

Examiner: Satyanarayan R. Gudibande

Serial No.: 10/030,944

Group Art Unit: 1654

Filed: September 3, 2003

Title: CYCLIC PEPTIDE DERIVATIVES AS INHIBITORS $\alpha\text{v}\beta\text{6}$

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated August 23, 2005 and the Response to Restriction Requirement filed October 24, 2005, Applicants hereby submit a Supplemental Response to Restriction Requirement. The attached Supplemental Response to Restriction Requirement corrects an inadvertent omission from the Amendment filed October 24, 2005. The Examiner was informed on November 18, 2005 that a Supplemental Response to Restriction Requirement would be filed.

Applicants hereby elect with traverse Group I, Claims 1-7, directed to cyclic peptides. For species purposes, Applicants elect compound 271593 listed on Table 1 on Page 29.

Applicants disagree with the examiner's characterization of the claimed peptides on Page 1 of the Office action. For example, the peptide comprises various X^n amino acids as literally defined in the claims, as well as an R^1 group. For species purposes, Applicants elect compound 271593 listed on Table 1 on Page 29.

All the claims in the application involve related subject matter, e.g., cyclopeptides as recited in Claim 1. A search would therefore comprise overlapping subject matter, and it would not be an undue burden on the examiner to carry out a search. "If search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner *must* examine it on the

merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct invention.” (Emphasis added.)

M.P.E.P. 803. Accordingly, withdrawal of the restriction is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the claims begin on page 3 of this paper.